Art Research News

Volume 2 Number 4/1983

THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART LIBRARY NEW YORK

Art Research News is the membership publication of the International Foundation for Art Research.

THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART LIBRARY NEW YORK

St. Joseph Holding the Christ Child
18th century, Cuzco School

Discoveries in Peru: The Cuzco School of Painting

From the early seventeenth century through the eighteenth century, the Andean town of Cuzco, Peru was one of the high cultural centers of the New World. Established in the fourteenth century as the capital of the Inca Empire, Cuzco occupied a crucial strategic position at the intersection of the highlands roads across which all the traffic of the empire passed. After the Spanish conquest, one of whose major objectives was to conquer Cuzco, the town reestablished itself as a commercial center under the Spanish viceroy, who ruled from the newly founded city of Lima. Now at the crossroads of what had become a Spanish mining empire, Cuzco thrived as a business center and a stopping place for traders and travelers. Yet at the same time, it retained its preeminence as the spiritual center for the highland Indians, and in Cuzco the art and monuments of Inca and Spanish culture could be seen side by side. Great numbers of paintings, sculptures, and edifices were created in Cuzco at the demand of the newly rich mine operators and of the equally wealthy religious orders that had come to Latin America to Christianize the Indians.

Today, the city of Cuzco, nestled at 12,000 feet above sea level into a broad valley that separates the high peaks of the Andes, offers little attraction to the ambitious businessmen who once supported the glory and renown of the town. But Cuzco has undergone a recent rebirth, largely because it has been rediscovered by tourists attracted by the appeal of its magnificent monuments, both pre-Hispanic and colonial.

Since the early 1950s, when a devastating earthquake nearly destroyed the city, there has been an ambitious program to restore Cuzco's major edifices. But among the last works to be given attention, paradoxically, are the great paintings that established the city's fame. As of 1983, there had been little effort to safeguard and preserve the hundreds of artworks within the many churches and convents of the area. Furthermore, even the benign neglect that had characterized the maintenance of these paintings has declined in recent years. As a result of slow deterioration of religious practice, coupled with a dramatic worsening of Peru's economy in the last ten years, many churches have been left without custodians. And recent political changes in the area have led to a breakdown of the traditional maintenance system for the religious institutions in the provinces surrounding Cuzco. A series of disastrous thefts has occurred from these remote churches. Some of the stolen paintings are known to have found their way into the international market, prompting the town fathers of Cuzco to band together and form a committee to defend the artistic patrimony of Cuzco, as well as to draw international attention to these resources. Through Peru's legal representative in the United States, this committee contacted IFAR and asked if help could be provided in the emergency cataloguing of these works, as a first step towards their preservation. IFAR responded with a program to dispatch teams of experienced cataloguers and photographers to Peru for short periods of time to do intensive inventory work in the churches. Support was obtained from several American donors, who were interested in saving an important art historical resource, and in supporting grassroots-level identification and maintenance of such cultural landmarks. Funding from the Kress Foundation, the National Geographic Society, and the Organization of American States, as well as two private donors, has allowed IFAR to send two teams of workers to Peru for one month of work. Already, more than 1000 paintings have been photographed and inventoried, providing a fairly representative view of the great variety, quality, and interest of the works.

Upon arrival in Cuzco, IFAR learned that previous inventory records, established and maintained by the National Institute of Culture, had mysteriously disappeared within the last few years. Thus the project that had been conceived as an emergency campaign to complement or extend existing records has instead become a comprehensive program to create primary documentation of the artistic resources of Cuzco. The IFAR team joined forces with the photographic inventory group of the National Institute of Culture branch in Cuzco, and the two have worked side by side—the visiting team cataloguing and photographing paintings while the Peruvian team concentrates on liturgical objects, furniture, and sculpture. Thus it has been possible within a short time to inventory the entire artistic and liturgical program of a church, a project which would have taken the local team considerable time. IFAR is creating an archive in New York of the photographs and records it produces, available for consultation by scholars, and hopes eventually to generate funds for the program through the sale of 8 x 10 glossy photographs to other Latin American studies programs in the United States and abroad.

It has been said of Spanish colonial painting that all the important works are direct copies from European examples. While the IFAR team found during its first field program that Cuzco painting is founded upon the bases of a variety of different European styles, artists in Cuzco—often Indians who developed painting skills working from examples visible in the town—were ingenious and imaginative in their use of these European models, and seem to interpret the European iconography in an original way. Rooted in European sixteenth-century mannerism, Cuzco painting evolved a style of its own, which employed a fascinating and very specific set of iconographical conventions, many of which would seem to incorporate and draw upon the earlier traditions of the Peruvian region before the Conquest. The depth and range of this iconographical aberration has not been fully explored, although a recent work which appeared this year in Peru[1] has added greatly to our knowledge.

The founding of the Cuzco school is perhaps the easiest point in its evolution to trace. It began with visits to the city of Italian and Spanish masters, such as the Florentine mannerist painter Bernardo Bitti, in the late sixteenth century. Bitti was summoned to Cuzco in 1583 by the Compañía del Gesú, and remained there for about eighteen months. He made a second visit to Cuzco about 1595. It is from this latter period that one of the important works inventoried by IFAR, *the Assumption of the Virgin with the Trinity* (Fig. 1), is believed to date.[2] This work, which de Mesa and Gisbert feel is the one commissioned by Father Manuel Vasquez for the Colegio de la Compañía,[3] is now found in the church of La Merced, one of Cuzco's greatest artistic monuments. Bitti's depiction of the *Assumption* makes use of the Florentine mannerist pastel color scheme and the repertory of elongated figures and *contrapposto* poses inherited

Fig. 1. The Assumption and Coronation of the Virgin *by Bernardo Bitti, dated by José de Mesa to ca. 1595. Church of La Merced, Cuzco.*

Fig. 2. Aged St. Peter Nolasco Borne by Two Angels *by Marcos de Rivera, 17th century. Church of La Merced, Cuzco.*

Fig. 3. St. Peter Nolasco Borne by a Choir of Angels before His Death *by Claude Mellan, 1627.*

New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art

Fig. 4. The Miraculous Draught of the Fishes *by Diego Quispe Tito, 17th century. Cuzco Cathedral. Note the fishes, symbol of Pisces, framed by clouds, top center.*

from Vasari, Pontormo, and the mannerist style. One of the earliest large paintings done by a European master in Cuzco, this work must have generated a great number of copies and variations. Throughout Cuzco painting, even into the eighteenth century, we see a strong mannerist strain, which accounts for some of the formalization of pose and the broad rendering of volumes which are hallmarks of the later style. In addition, the subject of the *Trinity* will become one of Cuzco's most interesting iconographic innovations.

In the next generation, a number of local artists come to light, who were born and possibly trained in Cuzco. One such artist is Marcos de Rivera, a native of Peru, although probably from Spanish parents.[4] According to de Mesa, there is no evidence that Marcos de Rivera studied under European masters; instead, his examples must have been the imported European works available in Cuzco and Lima. Described as the most important Peruvian disciple of Zurburan, Rivera also seems to have been very much under the influence of the Italian mannerist and early baroque tradition. One of his most important paintings is a picture of the *Aged St. Peter Nolasco Borne by Two Angels*, (Fig. 2) also in the important church of La Merced, inventoried by IFAR. This work is based directly on an engraving by Claude Mellan,[5] a French seventeenth-century engraver who worked in Rome as one of the artists of the Counter Reformation (Fig. 3). Whether the unusual iconography of this work was commissioned directly by the Counter Reformation church, consciously catering to the particular attachment to angels that has been noted in the art of the New World, or whether it is based on an Italian prototype, the theme became a popular one in Cuzco. The painting is known to have been copied at least twice. These copies are also preserved in La Merced along with the original, and several other works catalogued in Cuzco show its influence. As does Bitti's *The Assumption of The Virgin*, the unusual iconography of this painting points to a preoccupation of the Cuzco school: a preoccupation with angels in general and the archangels in particular, which will persist through the developments and changing styles of the following century.

Another scholar of Cusco painting, Leopoldo Castedo, has noted that of the forty-seven artists documented in Cuzco over the two hundred year period from 1600 to the end of the eighteenth century, thirty-five were Indians.[6] The first important Indian painter to come to light is the artist Diego Quispe Tito. It is known that he was an Indian because many of his works are signed "Diego Quispe Tito Inca," a designation that indicates that he is a native American of noble class. According to de Mesa and Gisbert, Quispe Tito's works pass through three periods, beginning in a mannerist style, developing into an anecdotal and free period typical of original American naive works, and culminating with the introduction of another important element in the formation of Cuzco painting, the influence of Flemish engravings. One of Quispe's last projects is an ambitious cycle of paintings now conserved in the Cathedral of Cuzco representing the signs of the Zodiac, combined with scenes and parables from the life of Christ. (Fig. 4.) The series is based on engravings by the Dutch artist Hans Bol,[7] and from the period in which these paintings were created—ca. 1660—Dutch and Flemish engraving, especially from Antwerp, played a large part in the formation of Cuzco imagery. De Mesa notes that this series is the only occurrence of zodiac iconography in Cuzco painting; certainly the combination of the pagan subject with New Testament narrative iconography is an unusual and puzzling juxtaposition to be found in religious painting of the seventeenth century. The commission of the engravings by Bol sheds some light. It calls for "Holy pictures with twelve celestial signs for all the months of the year: for all men of Christ: which stars are used for recognizing the eras begun by God (as in Genesis). They present the nature of idolatrous practices, may the practices of these same creatures be prevented by the one Creator of all things and the mystical heavenly kingdom be revealed to all eyes."[8] As early as 1613 the Spanish archbishop in Lima noted the persistence of pagan practices among the people of Peru, whom he characterized as "all idolators," and in 1619, a persecution of pagans proceeded. It seems, though, that the church was unsuccessful in putting an end to the traditional beliefs of the people, and throughout the seventeenth century, it tried to counteract these beliefs by creating examples and reminders of the Christian faith, as well as examples of the incorrect or incomplete nature of other faiths. Quispe Tito, according to de Mesa, probably took up this theme in order to create a beautiful example of the way in which the Christian faith succeeds and supercedes the traditional belief held by the Indians. However, it could also be argued, especially in light of the exceptional beauty of these works, that Quispe Tito, having reached full maturity as a painter, and being an Indian himself, saw in Bol's engravings an opportunity to give the astrological practices of his people a place of dignity and importance within the framework of the new religion. We will see in the eighteenth-century paintings of Cuzco repeated examples of the way in which the indigenous artists adopted the European iconography for their own use, thus creating a new synthesis, completely outside the staid conventions of the Council of Trent.

By the 1700s, workshops in Cuzco were mass-producing paintings, using a small repertory of subjects. One of the recurrent themes of this school is the Christian archangels (Fig. 5-6), who are represented as defenders of the Church and the faith. The archangels are clothed in highly stylized and elaborate costumes, such as were worn, according to Castedo, by the viceroys, judges, and high dignitaries.[9] Perhaps this is an effort to exhalt the archangels in the hierarchy within the Church, for they seem to appear as helpers of a celestial order in most of the important paintings of the period.

Perhaps the most stunning Latin American characterization of an archangel is the *Archangel Barachiel with Harquebus* (Fig. 6), an iconographic usage that seems peculiar to Cuzco and Alto Peru. According to Castedo, Barachiel was the favorite of astrologers and alchemists. "He is invoked to bring luck in games of chance, and in a remarkable coincidence with pre-Colombian myth he is the master of lightning."[10]

Another iconographic aberration of great charm is the depiction of St. Joseph. Unlike the European school model, which shows St. Joseph as an elderly man of modest origin in rough clothes, always slightly apart from the Holy Family, the Cuzco St. Joseph is a young, handsome, doting father. Cloaked in elaborate robes, carrying the lily of the Annunciation, he is a substitute for the Virgin herself, and pays tender and solicitous homage to the infant Christ. One lovely example of this theme was catalogued by IFAR during its first campaign. In this painting (cover), St. Joseph is shown in the Flemish circle of flowers usually reserved for the Virgin or the Virgin and Child.

Fig. 5. The Archangel Raphael, *18th century. Cuzco School.*

Fig. 6. The Archangel Barachiel with Harquebus, *18th century.*

Fig. 7. The Assumption and Coronation of the Virgin, *18th century. Cuzco School.*

Fig. 8. The Presentation of the Virgin at the Temple, *18th century. Cuzco School.*

Another unusual, and in fact heretical interpretation of Christian iconography is seen in the presentation of the *Trinity* in Spanish colonial paintings, particularly those of the Cuzco school. Rather than depicting the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, with the latter usually represented as a dove, the Latin American trinity shows three anthropomorhpic Christs of equal size and hieratic importance. Castedo explains this unusual usage—which was banned by the Pope, but nevertheless persisted throughout Latin America—as an effort to make graphic and visual a difficult abstraction in Christian belief, that of the triple nature of God, who is nevertheless a single being rather than a pantheon of forces.[11] It may well be, however, that the Trinity of Latin America stems in part from profound associations with pagan or historical legend before the Conquest.

In a fine Cuzco school painting of the *Assumption of the Virgin* (Fig. 7), many elements of the Cuzco style come together. By contrast with the Bitti *Assumption of the Virgin* dating from the late sixteenth century, this work has formalized the roles of all the participants in the drama. The triple anthropomorphic Trinity crowns the Virgin, who is shown without the usual symbols of Crucifixion and Resurrection that accompany her in European versions of this theme. She is flanked by angels, acting as acolytes. The principal appeal of the painting is the richness of its ornamentation, and the very naivete of the formalized conception. As Castedo aptly notes, the late Cuzco style may represent "one of the clearest revivals of the European medieval tradition."[12]

Throughout the small churches of the department of Cuzco, one finds paintings notable for the vividness of their color, the luxurious detailing of birds and flowers that fill the narrative scenes, and the richness of their gold brocade stipling, which covers the figures' garments, and sometimes the very landscape. These elements together bring to the Cuzco school a popular appeal quite different from the ambition and austerity of baroque painting in Europe at the time. (Fig. 8), The Cuzco school offers the opportunity for a great rediscovery of a fascinating and neglected area of cultural history, and it is with a sense of both mission and adventure that IFAR is continuing to support a project that initially has yielded so much.□

Bonnie Burnham

Notes

[1]José de Mesa and Teresa Gisbert, *Historia de la Pintura Cuzqueña*, (Fundación Augosto N. Wiese, 1982).

[2]Ibid., p. 62 and plate II.

[3]Ibid., note 32 and 33.

[4]Ibid., p. 126.

[5]Martin S. Soria, "Una nota sobre pintura colonial y estampas europeas," *Anales del instituto de arte americano e investigaciones esteticas*, 5 (1952): 43-49 (Univ. de Buenos Aires). Fig. 1; see also de Mesa, op. cit., p. 125.

[6]Leopoldo Castedo, *The Cuzco Circle* (New York, Center for Inter-American Relations, 1976), p. 34.

[7]de Mesa, p. 155, fn 52.

[8]See original Latin, cited in de Mesa, p. 157.

[9]Castedo, op. cit., p. 124.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid., p. 55.

[12]Ibid., p. 50.

Cultural Property Advisory Committee Members Named

The White House has announced appointments to the Cultural Property Advisory Committee. The committee was established under the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, which Congress passed last year. This law empowers the President to enter treaties to limit the importation of archaeological and ethnograhic material from specific countries, as an effort to counteract the looting and illicit exportation of this material, when these practices constitute a serious threat to the country's cultural heritage. The Cultural Property Advisory Committee's role is to advise the President on the requests from foreign countries for the establishment of such treaties.

The committee will consist of eleven members, ten of whom have been nominated: two curators, three art scholars, two art dealers, and three in the public interest. One additional dealer remains to be named. The nominees are as follows:

Curatorial
Arthur A. Houghton, associate curator of antiquities, J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu, California.
Patricia Rieff Anawalt, consulting curator, Museum of Cultural History, University of California at Los Angeles.

Scholarly
Clemency Coggins, research fellow, Peabody Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Denver Fred Wendorf, Distinguished Professor, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.
Leslie Elizabeth Wildesen, adjunct professor, department of history, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

The Art Trade
Alfred Stendahl, director, Stendahl Art Galleries, Los Angeles, California.
James Crowley, Spartanburg, South Carolina.

The Public Interest
John J. Slocum, trustee and executive committee member, Archaeological Institute of America.
Michael Kelly, chairman, Kelco Industries, Woodstock, Illinois.
James William Alsdorf, chairman, Alsdorf International Ltd., Chicago, Illinois.□

The Theft of Peru's Past*

Courtesy of National Geographic Society—Victor Boswell

Gold mask with incised ears and earrings of the Moche Vicus culture, ca. A.D. 514.

Standing in the US Customs office in early January, 1981, I felt overwhelmed by the ancient Peruvian gold, pottery and cloth that was spread about me on the tables and shelves. Four suitcases, stuffed to capacity with pre-Hispanic objects, had been seized the day before at Dulles Airport from a New York City art dealer, who had made a false customs declaration of the quantity and value of the items.

The pieces he was carrying were truly remarkable: many were unique and had no equal, even in Peru's own national museum. An acute sense of loss colored my admiration of these masterpieces. Like 99 percent of the pre-Hispanic art displayed in museums, they had been illegally ripped out of archaeological sites and, by those violent and clandestine acts, most of their scientific value had been irretrievably lost. For each of the choice pieces found in that dealer's luggage, there were dozens of artifacts and human bones discarded as worhtless by the looters on the sands of Peru's coast. Investigations following on the heels of the detention of the airport materials soon led to hundreds of other Peruvian antiquities which had been smuggled out of Peru by the same dealer in flagrant disregard for Peruvian law, which has strictly regulated the export of antiquities for commercial ends since 1929.

The destruction of Peru's past by the ignorant and the avaricious has been going on for centuries without intervention by the governments of the nations whose museums and private collections are the principal market for the pillaged remains. Recent events signal a turning point in this historical trajectory. Pizarro and his companions had little appreciation or respect for the achievements of Inca and pre-Inca craftsmen; they unceremoniously melted down the golden statues of gods, ancestors, plants and animals, along with the sheets of precious metal stripped from temple walls. Much of the Peruvian gold and silver that fueled the 16th century Spanish economy (including some fifty million dollars of buillion obtained from Atahualpa's ransom), came from the smelting of thousands of Inca objects and artifacts obtained by the looting of pre-Inca archaeological sites like Chan Chan, capital of the Chimú kingdom.

By 1561, King Phillip of Spain had already established provisions governing the Peruvian archaeological sites. A 1574 reformulation of this decree stipulated that before digging could begin at ancient holy sites or *huacas,* a government license had to be obtained and a supervisor, named by the Crown's representatives, had to be present during the unearthing of treasures. Reports were required every two months, but after registration the precious metal artifacts were taken to the nearest foundry. One particularly ambitious company received a license to work a parcel of land in the Moche Valley, which included the Huaca del Sol, the largest building erected in the capital of the Moche kingdom. By diverting a nearby river, these Colonial entrepreneurs were able to mine the pyramid hydralically, washing away an estimated 50 million or more adobe bricks. They destroyed over half of the *huaca,* including its summit that may have held the mausoleum of the ancient Moche emperors. Priests, charged with the extirpation of idolatry, sought out, registered, and burnt or destroyed innumerable mummies, ritual objects and *huacas.* Interest in preserving or protecting pre-Hapsanic Peruvian objects because of their value as works of art or as curiosities was foreign to the spirit of the European con-

querors of Peru. Although Viceroy Francisco de Toledo suggested that selected items be sent back to the royal court of King Phillip II, this idea was apparently not carried out until 200 years later.

The search for gold and silver artifacts that characterized the centuries following the Spanish conquest was undeniably destructive, but the pace and extent of the looting of archaeological sites began to rapidly accelerate with the appearance of an international market for the relics of ancient Peru. Most major European and North American academic and national museums were first established in the 19th century and these museums, with their interest in the "natural history" of the world, provided the first mass market for Peruvian antiquities. Travelers, diplomats and scientists working in Peru acquired collections or engaged in excavations in order to enhance the holdings of their own national museums. Private collecting increased in Peru as local connoisseurs emulated the foreigners, and realized that their collections could be sold abroad for a handsome profit. The development of railroads, like the Lima-Chancay line, uncovered large cemeteries at Ancon and Pasamayo, and further encouraged looting. By 1978 officials of the Peruvian government could already complain that "the monuments of national archaeology now belong to everybody but the Republic." The exhibition and publication of Peruvian antiquities in Europe and the United States was a double-edged sword: it stimulaed interest in the scientific study of Peruvian archaeology, but it created an even greater demand by foreign museums for new acquisitions.

Coeval with the 19th century surge in the pillaging of pre-Hispanic cemeteries was the emergence of an unambiguous commitment by a newly independent government to the principle of preserving archaeological sites and the materials recovered from them. A Peruvian decree of 1822, legalized by San Martin, established that all archaeological monuments were property of the national government and that excavation of artifacts was only permitted with a special government license. A national museum was established in Lima to conserve and display the materials removed from these *huacas,* and its first director was appointed by no less than Simon Bolivar. The spirit of the 1822 decree has been reiterated in numerous laws since that time, including an 1893 decree against clandestine excavations, and a 1929 law (Ley 6634) assigning title to all archaeological sites and unexcavated artifacts to the government of Peru. This law explicitly prohibited the looting of sites for commercial ends and the unauthorized exportation of archaeological pieces. By 1958, export of all pre-Hispanic objects for sale abroad had been banned. The underlying proposition of laws governing Peruvian archaeological sites and their contents is the conviction that since this record is the irreplaceable and non-renewable testimony of the nation's past, the government, as the recognized representative of the entire nation, has the obligation to act against individual interests. Peru's past, embodied in archaeological sites and their contents, is recognized as the patrimony of the nation, the birthright of its citizens. Consequently, archaeological materials are viewed in a fundamentally different way than, for instance, potatoes or transistor radios, which can be produced and sold in response to market demands.

Despite the laws of the Peruvian government, the worldwide economic situation precipitated an escalation of looting and illegal export of antiquities in the 20th century, especially during the last three decades. In the 1950s and 1960s, price increases and profits in the art market outpaced other types of high risk investments. Art dealers sought to diversify the market and found that pre-Hispanic antiquities, whose cost was low in the countries of origin, could provide financial returns surpassed only by the illegal drug traffic. A combination of these collectors, new museums in the secondary cities of Europe and America, and the older museums, provided a demand which outstripped the capacity of the looters, even at the accelerated rate of destruction. Gradually the lone *huaquero* searching for tombs with his metal rod (*sonda*) was replaced by large crews financed by land owners or private enterprises.

By the 1960s on the north coast of Peru, squads of up to 800 men and imported bulldozers were working full time demolishing pyramids and cutting twenty feet deep into ancient cemeteries of Piura and Lambayeque. Archaeologists have estimated that at the Batán Grande complex alone, over 250,000 burials have been desecrated by *huaqueros*. At the same time, archaeological knowledge of these remains is based on fewer than a dozen excavated tombs. New archaeological cultures have been uncovered and then obliterated during the looting of the past two decades. Perhaps the most notable of these discoveries were the cemeteries of the previously unknown Vicus culture in the early 1960s and the "Tembladera" cemeteries of the Jequetepeque Valley in 1967-8. The first complete archaeological study of the mid-Jequetepeque Valley was only recently completed, but all 22 of the early cemeteries which were located had been completely destroyed. Thus, the pottery from the graves of the Tembladera are now well represented in museums throughout the world, but almost nothing is known about the graves that produced these masterpieces.

The destruction of these cemeteries is especially tragic considering recent progress in the reconstruction of prehistoric social and ideological systems on the basis of burials, and new methods of skeletal analysis which permit inference of the patterns of disease and diet of ancient populations. Information that can be gleaned from pillaged objects in collections or museums is usually trivial compared to what can be inferred from the same material excavated *in situ.*

Thus, the problem of looting is centuries old, but the present level of destruction is really quite new. The damage it produces threatens to obliterate substantial portions of Peru's past for all time. Karl Meyer has aptly compared this situation to the burning of the library at Alexandria, Egypt.

But how do we put out the fire? There is no simple answer to this question, but the actions that culminated in this manual are steps in the right direction. The related exhibition commemorates not only an historic event, the return of nearly 700 looted antiquities to Peru, but it also celebrates the advent of a new policy of active cooperation between the United States and Peru to prevent not only the theft, but also the destruction, of Peru's remarkable past. □

Richard L. Burger
Yale University

**This article has been reprinted from* Peruvian Antiquities: A Manual for United States Customs, *a catalogue with commentary prepared by the Department of Cultural Affairs of the Organization of American States.*

Missing Links

by R. Wallace Stuart

R. Wallace Stuart is assistant general counsel of the United States Information Agency. The Agency is charged, in part, with the implementation of the UNESCO Convention for the prevention of illicit traffic in cultural property. Stuart visited the exhibition, recently renamed Peru's Artistic Heritage, *and here records his personal reaction to the experience.*

Courtesy of National Geographic Society—Victor Boswell

Fig. 1. Double spout and bridge jar with polychrome painted "bloody mouth" motif. Nasca Culture, A.D. 450. South Coast of Peru.

Each day the attention of the American public is drawn more and more to the global problem of illicit traffic in the art and antiquity of the world. Some of the outlines of the problem were dramatically demonstrated in the exhibit *Peru's Artistic Heritage,* a didactic presentation which was on display in Explorers Hall of the National Geographic Society in Washington, D.C. until January 15, 1984. The point eloquently made by the exhibit is that of the destruction of archaeological context wrought by looters who invade ancient sites with gross tools and implements, hacking out the traces of past civilizations for sale to the highest bidder. Most of the pre-Columbian items in the exhibit were seized in January 1981 by the U.S. Customs Service.

The problem of illicit traffic in art and antiquities, or cultural property, is not a new one. The exhibit emphasizes that the despoliation of Peru's cultural treasures began with Pizarro and his attempts to bring the wealth of the New World back to the Old. The Old World still buys New World art, but now, according to some estimates, it is the United States that has taken the lead in the world's antiquities market.

Legal Background

Peru's Artistic Heritage highlights some of the legal background affecting efforts to stem illicit traffic in cultural property. On November 14, 1970, 77 nations approved the UNESCO Convention on The Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. While the United States was one of the approving nations in 1970, and the Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification of this treaty in 1972, it was only on January 12, 1983, that legislation was approved which enables the United States to ratify the UNESCO Convention.

Arriving at this legislation, passed during the December 1982 "lame-duck" session of Congress, involved seemingly endless negotiations among the various interests affected by the law. Participating in the Congressional negotiations were the U.S. Customs Service, the United States Information Agency (USIA), the Department of State and the Department of Justice, associations of archaeologists, art and antiquities dealers and museum professionals.

The new law is known as the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act. It enables the United States to institute import restrictions on (previously published) categories of archaeological and ethnological cultural properties from state parties to the Convention. The law also makes illegal the importation into the United States of cultural property stolen from museums and other religious or secular institutions abroad, if the object is on an inventory of the institution.

The Cultural Property Advisory Committee, which is to be comprised of eleven members, appointed by the President, is established by the Act to represent the interests of archaeologists, anthropologists, ethnologists, dealers (or other experts in international sale of cultural property), museum professionals, and the public. The Committee will investigate and review requests from parties to the Convention for United States assistance. It will advise the President on the decisions he must make under the Act.

Under the new Act, the United States may enter into bilateral or multilateral agreements for imposing import restrictions to stop the illicit flow of cultural property into the United States. If an emergency exists (as defined by the Act), the President may unilaterally institute such import restrictions. The public at large must first, however, receive notice in the *Federal Register* of the categories of property designated to be stopped at the U.S. border. The lists of designated items will be established by the Treasury Department and the United States Information Agency.

One aspect of the new Cultural Property Act already in effect is the provision to halt importation into the United States of documented treasures stolen from museums and other public institutions and monuments abroad. Return of the stolen treasures is also covered by the legislation.

Neither the law nor the Convention operates retroactively.

The United States Government already had taken steps to stem the illicit flow of art into this country. Apart from the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, we have a 1970 treaty with Mexico which provides for the location, recovery and return of stolen cultural properties.

In 1981, the U.S. entered into an executive agreement with Peru, similar to the U.S.-Mexican treaty, which provides for efforts by both countries, under their existing laws, to assist in the location, recovery and return of stolen cultural property of the other. A 1972 law regulating the importation of pre-Columbian monumental art and the National Stolen Property Act (along with court decisions interpreting the latter) are additional measures for checking illicit traffic.

The Exhibition

Entering *Peru's Artistic Heritage,* the legal aspects and customs considerations of the illicit traffic problem are immediately emphasized for the viewer. In the background the atmosphere of a Customs area at an airport is recreated by a sound recording. A narrated videotape of Andean looters, or *huaqueros,* scraping away layers of soil in a tomb in search of artifacts is shown on a television screen.

Moving into the next exhibit chamber, the viewer sees an aerial photograph of a Peruvian plain and on it, the remnants of a once great city named Chan Chan. From the air, the pockmarks and craters left by looters dominate the landscape. According to the legend, it was the largest known city of ancient South America and the capital of the Chimu Kingdom from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries. From the photograph, Chan Chan appears to have been a target of saturation bombardment. It is inconceivable that anything of archaeological or historical value could be gleaned from the devastated site of the ancient city. In fact, the looting has greatly impeded ongoing archaeological excavations there.

To the left of pillaged and despoiled Chan Chan, the historical context of the displayed art is presented on a time line representing human history, with Peruvian culture illustrated by backlighted color slides of representative art from various periods and cultures: the Olmec, Chavin, Paracas, Nazca, ca. 1000-100 B.C. (Fig. 1); the Moche, Tiahuanaco-Huari, Chimú and Inca, ca. A.D. 400-1500 (Fig. 2 and 3).

Adjacent to the time line, an attractive educational display visually and verbally describes various ancient Peruvian cultures. It includes an enormous map of Peru and on the map, groups of artifacts from the several cultures. The representative artifacts of these various pre-Columbian cultures are mainly polychrome pots and drinking vessels. Many have stirrup handles with spouts at the top.

In the next room, the problem of the destruction of archaeological context by looters is treated by contrasting the scientific methods and tools of the archaeologists with those of the *huaqueros.* The archaeological excavation is illustrated here by text and pictures of excavations precisely crisscrossed by string grids. Each location is observed and recorded as the archaeologists work their way through the levels of history. Each item is catalogued and described to record its precise location. Graphics show how soil from the excavation is sifted for smaller items and artifacts, and how items found imbedded in the earth are painstakingly extracted with dental probes and brushes. Following excavation, the pictures demonstrate cleaning of the artifacts in the laboratory, and additional observation and examination of the finds.

In the center segment of this area of the exhibit, there are a number of textile, pottery and metalwork artifacts including jewelry. The legend "culture and age unknown" appears under many of the items, and a number of them bear no description at all. The implication is inescapable. Their identity and provenance are unknown, and could only be established by conjecture.

The third segment of the room is devoted to the looter. Contrasted with the delicate scientific tools of the archaeologist is a crude implement consisting of a long steel rod with a handle at the top for probing into the ground to find hollows that could be tombs. Alongside the probe are a large shovel, a pick, and dynamite. On the wall is a picture of a bulldozer brushing away vegetation along with traces of history.

Another item on the looters' side of this display is a dull reddish-brown polychrome ceramic vessel. It has the familiar stirrup handle with two monkey figures on either side and a pencil-sized hole in its top half. The legend states that this hole "probably was created by a looter's metal probe." Next a Moche-style animal shaped pot of light grey and white, according to its label, survived "the process intact...but reveals nothing of its origin." Beside the pot is a brown, egg-shaped head, its mouth opened wide in a yawn or scream. Pain is suggested by the eyes, which are squeezed shut. The head bears the description, "Looted, unknown, it defies interpretation and remains a missing link."

On the exit side of this exhibit chamber, there is a vertical stand with a slide show screen and earphones to enable viewers to hear the fable of a little ceramic owl figure. The sounds are of digging followed by the noise of breaking pottery. The listener is told that the looters have broken through the centuries of earth covering the little figure and a looter's pick shatters it. It is a fable, but it could be fact.

The last exhibit area is devoted to proving the case that historical knowledge is irretrievably lost when the context of archaeological artifacts is destroyed. This room features highlighted and enlarged excerpts from magazines and books, which advocate the analysis of artifacts in their archaeological context, and the study of customs and beliefs of surviving traditional Peruvian cultures, to substantiate their meanings to pre-Columbian culture.

Some of the outstanding pieces among the confiscated artifacts appear in this last area. Peruvian flute, drum and guitar music creates an evocative atmosphere for a display of a number of ceramic figures, grouped generally by their probable symbolism. One of the items is a polychrome pot, the top part of which appears to be a robe of an Indian figure with a red head wrapping. The strap or stirrup handle emerges from the figure's back and curves back to the lower part of the vessel. The single spout is red with a black stripe.

Plant and animal effigies, representing frogs, monkeys, and fanciful red and white snakes, are displayed. There are also bird and feline effigy pots, others in the shapes of fruits and vegetables, and an eye-catching crab-shaped pot appears with a shiny red, brown and ivory-colored parrot figure vessel next to it. Several human figures are shown in an adjacent display cube with battle and sacrifice the themes. Central to this display is a ceramic vessel shaped like a boat. The main figure, one arm missing, is a warrior.

One of the finest pieces of the entire exhibit is a cream-colored stirrup-handle pot from the Moche culture decorated with "bean runner" figures (Fig. 3). The handle emerges from the back of a seated

human figure on top of the vessel and terminates just above the vessel's midline. There is a single narrow spout in the top of the handle. The painted figures are called "bean runners" because of dried and decorated lima beans that were carried in their hand-held pouches and strung on their belts.

The quality of the items in the exhibit varies widely. Some of the pieces are beautiful and evocative. Others are grotesque. However, the significance of this exhibition is not so much in the aesthetic qualities of the individual pieces, as in the important story that is told about the loss of knowledge of our earlier history because there is a market which will pay well for such artifacts. *Peru's Artistic Heritage* is a graphically developed argument against the illicit market in cultural property. □

Courtesy of National Geographic Society—Victor Boswell

Fig. 2. Stirrup-spouted jar with large deity and smaller figures in the mountains. Red figure painting on the body of the vessel. Moche IV culture, A.D. 400. North coast of Peru.

Courtesy of National Geographic Society—Victor Boswell

Fig. 3. Stirrup-spouted jar with three-dimensional figure and painted "bean runners" on the body of the vessel. Moche IV culture, A.D. 400. North coast of Peru.

IFAR Board Profiles: Paul Guth and Daniel Zilkha

Daniel Zilkha, publisher of *Art and Auction,* and Paul Guth, a partner in the New York law firm of Kelley, Drye and Warren, are IFAR's newest board members. The story of how they both came to be in New York and became interested in the work of IFAR is another illustration of the wide-reaching interconnections that have been woven together to support this unusual arts organization.

Paul Guth

Paul Guth, a man of great personal charm, projects the image of an exemplary trust attorney, who would engender confidence in a client immediately. Precision, introspection and discretion characterize all of his comments. "For the sake of my clients my best energies are devoted to the law," he says with total sincerity. Contemplation of art is a source of relaxation and enjoyment, and even though he modestly claims to have little expertise in art, in conversation about his own collection and about his involvement with two notable art foundations, he is discerning and knowledgeable.

Guth is a member of the board of the Robert Lehman Foundation, and as such is involved with the transfer of the late Robert Lehman's art collection to the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Title was conveyed to the Museum in May 1975, but until then the Foundation has certain reserved "visitorial powers," and is cooperating with both the Museum and the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University in the preparation of a comprehensive catalogue of the collection, which will number from eight to twelve volumes when completed. A scholars' committee, chaired by Professor Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, professor of fine arts at the Institute of Fine arts, with two other members, Sir John Pope-Hennessy, professor of fine arts at the Institute of Fine Arts and consultative chairman of the department of European Paintings at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Professor Sydney Freedberg, Arthur Kingsley Porter professor of fine arts, emeritus, Harvard University, and now chief curator of the National Gallery of Art, is responsible for the writing and final editing of the catalogue.

Paul Guth

Guth's devotion to the Lehman legacy is tacitly acknowledged by a handsome color photograph which faces the viewer on entering his office. It depicts the entrance to the Lehman wing at the Met, a long vista with a portrait by Ingres that formerly graced the Lehman dining room at 625 Park Avenue. Guth commented on the style of the Lehman wing, which includes replicas of several rooms from the Lehman family house at 7 West 54th Street, which had been turned into a private museum by Robert Lehman. "Mr. Lehman felt strongly that there was educational value in seeing art hung in the places for which it was purchased. He wanted to transmit to the public the kind of enjoyment that he had experienced as a private collector." Until recent times, art was commissioned for private homes and churches. Its acquisition by great museums is a modern phenomenon.

Guth is also chairman of the Lutèce Foundation, which is engaged in fostering French-American cultural relationships. It subsidizes exhibitions such as the French Revolutionary drawings from the Musée Carnavalet in Paris, which was exhibited at the National Academy of Design in New York in September 1982. It also sponsors lectures in the United States by French scholars, and aids patrons who wish to make donations to French institutions or museums. Although the donor's wishes are carefully considered, the choice of the institution best suited to receive the gift rests with the Foundation.

Guth is Viennese by birth, a member of a family that owned an extensive retail business in home furnishings and rugs with branches in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Italy as well as in Austria. He had completed his secondary education at the Classical Gymnasium in Vienna, when the family left Austria in 1938 at the time of the *Anschluss* and came to the United States via England. He attended Columbia College in New York where his interest in constitutional history led him to the Columbia Law School. There he was a member of the Law Review board and winner of the Beck Prize as the best student in property law. This success encouraged him to specialize in trust work with an old established New York law firm, Lauterstein and Lauterstein, which merged with Kelley, Drye and Warren in 1981.

Art and European history from 1492 to the present are his two major interests beyond the law. In art, he modestly describes himself as "pure amateur. I acquire things because I like them. I don't know if my taste is well developed but it is pronounced." In the fifties he went to Parke-Bernet to buy furniture and bought his first painting, a portrait of the Marquess of Buckingham by Sir Thomas Lawrence. He prefers eighteenth century English painting and has concentrated on collecting Lawrence and Romney. He says he does not find Renaissance work especially appealing, with one notable exception, a small canvas by Lucas Cranach the Younger depicting St. John, the little Christ and an alligator. He says simply, "I liked it." It is also the only purchase he has ever had authenticated. He never buys as a capital invstment, but only for personal enjoyment. Everything he owns surrounds him at home. Nothing is in storage.

Guth noted that Robert Lehman, one of the greatest collectors of modern times, who had studied art at Yale, had set a standard for all collectors, great or small. He only bought for personal fulfillment. "He would have refused a $1,000,000 painting offered for $1,000 if he didn't like it."

Daniel Zilkha

In 1979 Daniel Zilkha decided to quit his career in banking and look for "a new opportunity." He had an idea for a newsletter of four to eight pages, listing each month's auctions, to be sold by subscription with little editorial comment and no advertising.

In May 1979 starting by himself in space rented from *The New York Review*

of Books and with technical assistance and advice from its publisher, Whitney Ellsworth, he launched the first 32 page mailing to 400 subscribers, described by him as "mainly personal contacts—family and friends." This modest debut received a good press, was described as a useful and interesting idea, and in two months there were 800 subscribers, primarily individual collectors and auction buffs, rather than dealers. Zilkha emphasizes that his beginning was the opposite of that of most publications, who carefully plan format, size, editorial content and advertising before they ever begin publication. *Art and Auction's* growth can best be described as organic. He says that he "felt his way into the approach," and compares the process to that which formed *The Economist* in London.

After the initial positive reaction changes were made as the subscription list grew. The original modest stock was replaced by glossy paper, a cover was added and then a perfect binding. Advertising was solicited and the original black and white format was replaced by four color production. Computer and typesetting equipment was purchased. The magazine is now published eleven times a year, with each issue averaging 100 pages, one-half of which is advertising. The circulation has reached 20,000 with 15,000 subscribers and is steadily growing. However, the heart and most important feature in each issue is still the calendar of auction events, with the listing free for auction houses and now galleries.

Zilkha has had no formal training in art. He does not edit, assigning that task to others, but runs the publication as a business. In his words, he has followed "a careful investment approach, growing conservatively, carefully adding to the quality of the product and the supporting staff." He has not been misled by grandiose planning, but seeks precisely to define what kind of communication is needed in the art market, and then provides that. He notes that all his competition has disappeared. In his view, they were all too general in approach, lacking focus and specialization. In attempting to appeal to everyone and serve all needs, they pleased no one. He commented that *Burlington Magazine* has been successful for many years because it focuses on scholarly, informed connoisseurship.

Although Zilkha describes himself as not being an "art professional," he is an extremely urbane, articulate, multilingual man whose experience and family background make his success in this field almost inevitable. He was born in Cairo, a member of a banking family whose Banc Zilkha was the largest Jewish financial institution in the Middle East. His father is Iraqi, a native of Baghdad, and his mother is of the fourth generation from Hebron, Palestine. Zilkha was educated in France through secondary school and then came to the United States, earning a degree in engineering from Princeton University in 1964. He went straight into banking after graduation, working in Switzerland, England, Japan and Canada. He then returned to the Harvard Business School for a MBA in 1969. After that came work in research and corporate finance for several Wall Street firms, a short stint with the family bank in Zurich, and a joint venture with Lehman Brothers in Geneva, in which he and his brother both participated.

Daniel Zilkha

In the meantime Zilkha had married an American, Frances Rogers, and in 1979 they decided to return to New York with their three children. He resigned from banking, this time for good. In reading his Publisher's Note in the October, 1983 issue of *Art and Auction,* one feels Zilkha really has found his *métier*. Business acumen and connoisseurship have coalesced in him, producing an enthusiasm and kinetic energy that are contagious and fairly leap off the pages of his magazine. Its rapid and continuing success is not hard to understand.

Zilkha first became aware of IFAR through Leon Levy, an IFAR board member and then met Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., IFAR's president. About two years ago he suggested incorporating *Stolen Art Alert* into *Art and Auction*. Nothing came of that idea, but in December, 1983 *Art and Auction* began publishing selected items from *SAA* to broaden the coverage and exposure of art theft now offered by IFAR.

Zilkha hopes to be a very active board member. He thinks IFAR lacks a strong public image. "The public must think of IFAR in connection with stolen art. It must see us as an important clearing house for information." He wants to reach out to a larger audience, including dealers, collectors and scholars. He envisions small seminars and receptions—about ten a year—with a specific theme for audiences who have been selected for their interest in that theme, such as a discussion of French furniture when a sale in that area is coming up. He favors small symposia with a scholar or dealer rather than large formal meetings, and would like specifically to devote himself to the "marketing function" of the organization.

He would also like to place more emphasis on the authentication service offered by IFAR, but has not yet exactly defined how that would be accomplished. He feels the service should be well known by the public but restricted in its availability. There must be some apparatus for screening clientele.

In defining an editorial policy for *Art and Auction,* Zilkha has very carefully zeroed in on the specific function of acquisition as a part of collecting. As far as connoisseurship is concerned he assumes the buyer has the knowledge or is getting help elsewhere. He would like to help focus IFAR's programs and image in the public mind in much the same way. When he speaks of "marketing function," he intends to define the product precisely and then tell the public why it needs it. □

Joan Huntoon

Forgery, Misattribution or Masterpiece?

Among the many clients of IFAR's authentication service, there is one who usually calls each year, and the conversation is always the same. "IFAR, I have just purchased two important prints today at auction, and I would like to bring them by right away to have them authenticated." A short while later in the office this New York collector explains that although he has no reason to doubt that his new Toulouse-Lautrec and Picasso are genuine, he doesn't want to discover ten years hence, if he decides to sell the prints, that they are not what they were purported to be.

IFAR wishes that all collectors would be as careful as this client when buying a work of art. In fact, a comprehensive examination before purchase is very desirable, but when buying at auction, there is often little time for such careful consideration. In this case, of the four prints authenticated for the client thus far, a Toulouse-Lautrec, a Winslow Homer and two Picassos, one work the Toulouse-Lautrec lithograph of *Le Petit Trottin*, 1893, proved to be inaccurately described in the auction house catalogue, and was a work of considerably less value (Fig. 1).

The colored lithograph was documented for sale as an impression from a first state of two with green stencil coloring and was listed in three standard references—Delteil (27), Adhémar (18), and Adriane/Wittrock (37). It bore no publisher's address nor printers stamp. As part of the examination IFAR consulted with a noted print expert who thought that it "did not look quite right" and finally determined that this example of *Le Petit Trottin* was not a first state of two with stencil coloring, but was actually a posthumous reprint of the third state as catalogued more recently by Wolfgang Wittrock in his 1976 *Toulouse-Lautrec: Das Gesamte Graphische Werk*, (Dumont Buchverlag, Köln, page 257). Delteil and Adhémar do not mention an edition in color, whereas Wolfgang Wittrock sets the record straight. He describes the first state as having been printed in black or olive-green and bearing the Kleinman dry stamp. The second state, which was stencil colored, bore the address of the publisher. The new printing of the third state, probably issued in the 1920s and therefore unknown to Delteil, having been printed after publication of his catalogue, was stencil colored and lacked the publisher's address. This posthumous or third state reprint of *Le Petit Trottin*, probably printed in the 1920s long after the artist's death, has significantly less value than a first state impression. Although the auction house eventually refunded the purchase price to our collector after being advised of IFAR's findings, they refused to reimburse the modest expenses incurred for the examination.

Although the purchase of the Toulouse-Lautrec lithograph did not constitute a substantial investment for this collector, the recent purchase of a Mark Rothko painting by another of IFAR's clients did. IFAR was contacted last fall by a couple who were considering the purchase of an untitled Mark Rothko painting on paper in colors of red and yellow. It was signed, "Mark Rothko 1967" on the back (Fig. 2). Because the work was not known to be a part of the Rothko inventory, it was important to the prospective buyers that the work be authenticated and its condition assessed.

IFAR arranged to have the painting examined by an art historian and conservator, both experts on Rothko's works. A careful inspection of the surface with ultraviolet and reflected light revealed no major restoration areas. The surface had been flattened slightly as a result of the paper having been mounted on canvas. There were a few brush hairs embedded in the pigment, which is characteristic of Rothko's work. The narrow border around the entire painting, which Rothko customarily kept untouched, was painted in by a restorer. This was a normal working procedure of the artist, who usually had his works mounted and the edges finished by a specific collaborator. In this case, the border paint was applied more freely than usual.

The experts agreed that there was nothing in the examination that indicated that the painting was not a genuine work by Rothko. The signature on the back, which was typical of Rothko after 1947, appeared correct, although it was more carelessly written than is usually seen. The work does not have an estate number, which implies that it was sold before 1969 when the artist began to inventory his works. IFAR also provided the prospective buyers with a more complete provenance of the work. As a consequence of IFAR's positive findings, the Rothko was purchased with confidence.

The most common authentication inquiry at IFAR concerns inherited works of art. One of the finest in this category recently is *Young Woman Writing a Letter*, which had been attributed to Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825) when the family purchased it in the late nineteenth century (Fig. 3). Although IFAR did not believe that current scholarship would support that attribution, the portrait was exceptionally well painted with a sensitivity and refinement exhibited throughout, especially in the figure's face and hands. The artist also displayed an outstanding ability to create the texture and luster of fabric.

Two of the four experts consulted by IFAR, had known of the portrait since the mid-1970s, primarily as the result of a study being conducted by Joseph Ballio of Wildenstein & Co., Inc. in New York, on the French artist, Rose Ducreux (d. 1802), the little-known eldest daughter of Joseph Ducreux, an established French Salon painter. There is little recorded information concerning her career, and much confusion about some of her paintings, which have been variously attributed to other artists, including Vigée-LeBrun. In addition, few of Ducreux's authenticated paintings or even photographs of her work are available for comparison, making it difficult to assign any work to her.

IFAR's examination included studying the few works that Ducreux is known to have exhibited at the Salon between 1791-1799, and doing extensive research on dating the sitter's costume. The painting was submitted to a thorough laboratory examination, which included x-rays and pigment tests. The surface of the painting was scrutinized with a binocular microscope. Particular attention was given to the abraded area of the letter the sitter is writing with the hope of discovering the identity of the sender or the recipient. Unfortunately, no legible script remains. The findings seem to indicate, however, that the work is by Rose Ducreux and IFAR tentatively attributes the portrait to her pending the publication of a monograph on the artist by Joseph Baillio, scheduled for publication this year.

Although misattributions and an occasional masterpiece are submitted for consideration, a large number of the art works IFAR examines turn out to be forgeries. These differ from "copies," which were generally the product of student

Le Petit Trottin *by Toulouse-Lautrec, sold as a first state lithograph, on close examination proved to be a posthumous reprint of the third state, and consequently, much less valuable.*

Portrait of Madame Hebuterne, *purchased as an original work by Modigliani, now proved to be a forgery.*

Private collection.

Untitled *by Mark Rothko. Oil on paper.*

Private collection.

Young Woman Writing a Letter *has been owned by the same family for almost one hundred years. When purchased it was attributed to Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825). A recent authentication examination resulted in a reassignment to Rose Ducreux (d. 1802).*

artists, in that a forgery, by definition, has been executed with the intent to deceive. They are most often done in the style of old and modern masters, such as Rembrandt, Velásquez, Renoir, Monet and Matisse. Amedeo Modigliani is another popular artist who has been forged hundreds of times and it appears that some of those works were executed by the artist's friends shortly after his death. Such was the case with a *Portrait of Madame Hebuterne* recently examined by IFAR (Fig. 4).

The expert consulted noted that there are a number of stylistic problems with the work. The painting lacks the firmness in linear quality that one would expect in an original work, where the lines are sure and taut. This is particularly noticeable in the mouth and in the eyebrows of the sitter, which are executed in a hesitant manner. Overall, the elegant lines for which Modigliani is known and appreciated are not evident in this work. The long neck is particularly lacking in grace. The outline is not clean and the paint is applied too heavily. The brushwork on the sitter's shoulders is crudely executed and her bangs are coarsely drawn and appear to have been reinforced.

The "Modigliani" is part of an estate that is now being dispersed. IFAR's report helped the executor's obtain a reduction in estate taxes for a work that had been purchased many years ago as an original.

Clients come to IFAR with questions as diverse as the objects themselves and with greatly varying needs. IFAR provides the research capability and expertise necessary to identify the forgery, the misattributed work of art and, very occasionally, the masterpiece.□

Virgilia H. Pancoast

The International Fund for Monuments: Architectural Preservation in Ireland

The Honorable Desmond Guinness, president of the Irish Georgian Society, was guest of honor at a reception on October 20, 1983 given by the International Fund for Monuments at its recently opened New York headquarters at 41 East 72nd Street. Mr. Guinness was on a semi-annual visit to the United States to lecture on the work of the Society, which he founded in 1958 to aid in the preservation of notable architecture of the eighteenth century in Ireland.

The International Fund for Monuments, with the financial support of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, has participated in three of the Society's major restoration projects: Castletown House in County Kildare, Damer House in Rosecrea, County Tipperary, and Doneraile Court, beside the town of Doneraile in County Cork.

Castletown House (1722), the largest Georgian mansion in Ireland, was bought by the Society to save it from speculators. The only country house in the Dublin area open to the public, it now serves as the Society's headquarters. Aided by a large matching grant from the Kress Foundation, Guinness is currently raising money to purchase the eighteenth-century furnishings in the house, which are on loan to the Society.

Damer House, which was built in 1714 and contains one of the finest carved wood staircases in Ireland, was saved from demolition by the Society in 1974. The magnificent staircase was fully restored with help from the I.F.M. The top floor of the house has been given over to the Irish Country Furniture Society, which is building a permanent collection of unique examples of Irish country furniture. On the main floor is a craft shop operated by the North Tipperary Craftworker's Association.

Doneraile Court was presented to the Society in 1976 by the Irish Minister of Lands at a "peppercorn rent" for a term of 99 years. A large, crumbling house on fifteen acres, four miles from the main Dublin-Killarney road, it needed a new roof, windows, replastering, and the entire interior redecorated. Again the I.F.M. and the Kress Foundation came to the rescue with very substantial financial support for the project.

Castletown House, near Dublin, which was purchased by the Irish Georgian Society to save it from speculators. The largest Georgian mansion in Ireland, it now serves as the Society's headquarters and is open to the public.

Since its inception, the Georgian Society, under Guiness's energetic and inspired direction, has completed about forty direct projects, following a precise *modus operandi* and concentrating on buildings under threat of demolition. According to Joseph D. Ryle, executive director of the Irish Georgian Society, Inc. in the United States, "There is no National Trust in Ireland and no funds whatsoever available from the State for restoration work, so it is important that there be an organization to preserve these buildings before they go into terminal decay." After a worthy building has been identified and acquired by the Society, the first step is to make the exterior sound: roof, walls and plasterwork are repaired. Then the restoration of the interior can progress, and at any point in this process, the Society will sell the building either for public or private use to an owner who agrees to maintain it in the style of its period. The money derived from the sale goes back into the Society's restoration fund.

Much of the salvage and restoration work has been done by volunteers, and thus far, Guinness has established twenty-two chapters of the Society in the United States with approximately 2500 members and an expanding program. Each year three or four trips to Ireland are planned, offering access to the great country homes not open to the public. In addition, arrangements have been completed with the Kindel Furniture Company and with Scalamandre Silks, Inc. to produce approximately twelve reproductions of Irish furniture and a line of fabrics based on antique Irish designs to be called the Hibernian Collection. These items will be available in the stores in the fall, with B. Altman and Co. carrying the line in New York.

Ryle commented that the Society in the United States has had a very positive effect on tourism in Ireland by arousing interest in the great Georgian houses. He said that Guinness had been very effective "in spreading the word" in his semi-annual tours here, often giving twenty lectures on each visit. In addition, Guinness, an Oxford University graduate, has written extensively on the subject of architecture, producing many articles and a number of books.[1]

Ryle went on to say that the Society was especially grateful to the I.F.M. and the Kress Foundation for their generosity and cooperation, which had given a great boost to the restoration work. In Ireland there is enormous interest in preserving the past, but the means to do so are limited and the number of projects considerable.

Further information about the International Fund for Monuments may be had by mail or telephone: 41 East 72nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10021; (212) 517-9367.□ *Joan Huntoon*

[1]**Books by Desmond Guinness**
Georgian Dublin (Batsford, 1979)
Irish Houses and Castles with William Ryan (Thames & Hudson, 1971)
The White House (McGraw-Hill, 1980)
Mr. Jefferson, Architect (1973)
Palladio, A Western Progress (1976)
Newport Restored (1981)
The last three are all in collaboration with Julius Sadler and published by Viking Penguin.

Linda E. Ketchum

Mrs. Douglas Auchincloss chats with Desmond Guinness, president of the Irish Georgian Society, at a reception in his honor on Oct. 20, 1983 at the recently established New York headquarters of the International Fund for Monuments at 41 East 72nd Street.

Arthur Q. Davis, president of DMJM Curtis and Davis of New Orleans, is greeted by Betty Burge Menell, IFM trustee and owner of Yale Burge Co., manufacturers of reproduction furniture in New York and Italy.

Linda E Ketchum

Linda E. Ketchum

Mrs. Sean O'Casey, (right) widow of the great Irish playwright, and H. McKelden Smith of Ogilvy and Mather are welcomed by Diana Donnelley, assistant to the director of the IFM.

The main staircase of Castletown House.

Doneraile court, Doneraile, County Cork in 1976 when its deeds were presented to the Irish Georgian Society and before any restoration began.

Damer House, Rosecrea, County Tipperary, now a museum, shown here in the course of restoration, stands inside the Norman castle walls in the center of the town.

The magnificent wood carved staircase in Damer House, which was restored by the Irish Georgian Society with financial assistance from the IFM and the Kress Foundation.

High Times in Atlanta

Ezra Stoller © ESTO

The atrium skylight in the High Museum. In addition there are smaller parametal skylights on the top floor.

The High Museum of Art in Atlanta opened in October 1983 with great critical acclaim and civic celebration. Both were fully justified. The Museum is not only housed in an innovative and inspiring building, but is developing collection policies that could become models for museums both well-established and fledgling.

Designed by architect Richard Meier and constructed of glass and 7000 white enamelled steel panels on a concrete frame and granite base, the building creates a sense of light and positive space rather than mass, even though it offers 46,000 square feet of exhibition space. The surrounding world and landscape flow into the structure through huge glass windows and through the skylight at the top of the central atrium.

The building itself is a work of art commensurate to its contents, and yet provides an unobtrusive setting that does not compete with, obscure or impede our vision of the exhibitions in any way. In addition the architect has achieved a high tech look, an image that semioticians could not say signals "museum" in our minds based on historical associations. Meier acknowledges a debt to Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim Museum, "because of the obvious similarity in terms of the ramps within the central space. But...I almost think it is more akin, conceptually, to the Frick Museum, which is organized around a garden courtyard in which the galleries open to that skylit garden...That main space, the atrium space, the social space, the public space, is the center, the core."

The atrium with ascending ramp in the High Museum affords both intimate and distant views of many galleries, often from unexpected angles. Huge white panels float at the top to provide light reflection. The artificial light is either recessed in the ceilings or is on unobtrusive symmetrical tracks. Many of the galleries have wall apertures in the oriental style, allowing sudden and unique views of certain objects. The entrance level has a marble floor with white columns, two benches and a simple marble pedestal for flowers. The white painted metal railings of the ramp provide a decorative touch on one side, with small areas of glass brick visible on interior walls forming two sides of the atrium. On another wall there are four watercolors, architects drawings depicting the museum and its auditorium in section and elevation. It is an interior space of artful simplicity and great serenity with a changing interplay of light and shadow as the day progresses, and with the surrounding neighborhood visible through the windows and the glass walls.

Standing on the ground floor the visitor is bathed in light from the wedge-shaped skylight at the top of the atrium. As he starts up the gently inclining ramp, the surrounding buildings and street come into view, reinforcing the feeling that the art is *in* the community, rather like the situation at the Fondation Maeght at Vence, in the South of France, where the French countryside comes right into the galleries to join the paintings and sculptures exhibited there. Here the first objects to be perceived are English porcelains—Derby, Staffordshire and Worcester—from the Museum's spectacular decorative arts collection. Then small African sculptures come into view. The large apertures on the ramp wall constantly afford visual access to both the atrium and the adjoining galleries, offering glimpses of art objects at a variety of angles. Next wrought iron furniture becomes visible. Then antique silver. Suddenly directly below us we see contemporary blown glass objects. Then as the ramp continues to rise, American painting, European art and then twentieth century painting on the highest level. The visitor has had full views of many objects and glimpses of hundreds of others without ever leaving the ramp.

The effect is stimulating and exciting, creating great expectations, and when our visitor leaves the ramp they will be amply fulfilled. To cite just one example, the High Museum has one of the most outstanding collections in the world of American decorative arts, in the period from 1825 to 1914, and a large part of it, the Virginia Carroll Crawford Collection, was acquired in the last four years. The precise method of acquiring these objects was exemplary.

In a sense the story begins back in 1966 and 1967 when Catherine Lynn, now assistant professor in the historic preservation division of the Columbia University graduate school of architecture and planning, was completing her master of arts degree at Winterthur in Delaware. There she met Katharine Farnham.

Farnham was to become the curator of decorative arts at the High Museum, and in 1978, encouraged by a growing interest in Atlanta in the decorative arts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in America, decided to develop a program for collecting. In the intervening time, Lynn had worked for eight years at the Cooper Union Museum in New York and then had been curator of wallpaper at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum

Ezra Stoller © ESTO

The High Museum of Art in Atlanta, designed by Richard Meier. The view from Peachtree Street.

Walnut, maple and poplar cabinet by Daniel Pabst of Philadelphia, ca. 1865. Virginia Carroll Crawford Collection, High Museum of Art.

Mantel clock of bronze, ceramic tile and glaze, ca. 1884 with tiles by J. & J.G. Low. Virginia Carroll Crawford Collection, High Museum of Art.

Silver pitcher and goblet, ca. 1845, by Zalmon Bostwick of New York. Virginia Carroll Crawford Collection, High Museum of Art. American silver in the Gothic mode is very rare.

Teapot, cast iron and silver with ebonized wood handle, 1902-1907 by Tiffany and Company. Virginia Carroll Crawford Collection, High Museum of Art.

which evolved from it. She credits her years in New York with her interest and expertise in nineteenth century decorative arts. Subsequently she served for two and a half years as curator of the Atlanta Historical Society, and then went to Yale to complete her Ph.D. degree.

In 1978 Farnham offered her a special research position for the summer with the specific assignment to develop strategy and recommendations for a greatly enlarged decorative arts collection in the High Museum. Lynn's subsequent report began with a detailed history of nineteenth century design and art theory. She noted that seventeenth and eighteenth century material was limited and very expensive at this late date, while in the nineteenth century area, there were many more objects available, and the relative lack of interest by private collectors had kept the prices down. She emphasized that in five years the High could have a collection in this area that would surpass any museum in the country.

Lynn is full of praise for her colleagues in the enterprise, Virginia Carroll Crawford and David A. Hanks. Mrs. Crawford, long a benefactor of the Museum, approached the High's director, Gudmund Vigtel, with the suggestion that she support a collection which would be developed in a short period of time and culminate in a special exhibition. When shown Lynn's report, she agreed immediately to finance the project.

David A. Hanks, a New York curatorial consultant, was then engaged as temporary consulting curator to the High Museum department of decorative arts with a mandate to purchase a nineteenth century collection. According to Hanks he traveled throughout the country, examining and buying objects, which were then shipped to New York for conservation, photography and storage. The High at that point had neither storage nor exhibition space for the growing collection, which now includes 139 objects, and Hanks found that his New York base gave him unparallelled resources for his task. The New York Public Library and the New York Historical Society were invaluable sources of information. Much of the restoration involved difficult upholstery and gilt work, which could only be accomplished there.

After Hanks located and recommended a piece, it was inspected and approved for purchase by curator Farnham and donor Crawford. Mrs. Crawford then bought the object and paid for its restoration. During the life of the project she paid all research and curatorial salaries as well. According to Hanks, "We were extremely lucky to have Mrs. Crawford. We went out to buy the best and she gave us the support to do it. We were able to go in and compete with private collectors in a way that institutions seldom can." He thinks that in the 1870-1890 period no other collection can touch the quality of the High pieces. The Smithsonian has more objects, but is more concerned with a total cultural reconstruction than with quality and connoisseurship. Catherine Lynn also describes Mrs. Crawford as a "bright, intelligent, responsive person with a wonderfully positive attitude." At this point the High has already received ownership of 20% of the Crawford collection, with the balance to follow in the future.

Mrs. Crawford's enthusiastic and total support of the decorative arts program is very typical of the attitude of her fellow Atlantans towards their museum, which is, at this point, completely free of debt. In three years Atlanta raised $20,000,000, beginning with a challenge grant of $7,500,000 from Robert W. Woodruff, and further aided by a second challenge grant of $900,000 from the Callaway Foundation in LaGrange, Georgia.

Both the design of the Museum building and the acquisition policies of its curatorial staff should be models for other institutions as the twenty-first century approaches—art and architecture that support and enrich each other. To visit this museum is truly an ennobling experience for the viewer. □

Joan Huntoon

The *Salvator Mundi* of Leonardo da Vinci?

The Salvator Mundi of Leonardo da Vinci
by Joanne Snow-Smith
Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington, Seattle, 1982. 96 pp.
$24.

Fig. 1. Salvator Mundi, *attributed to Leonardo da Vinci, ca. 1510-1513.*

Collection of Marquis de Ganay, Paris

It was about a year ago that I received a phone call from a journalist who wanted to know my opinion of a painting of Christ Blessing said to be by Leonardo da Vinci (Fig. 1). I was not familiar with the picture, and my response was simply that I had no opinion. Incredulous, the journalist went on to insist that this was a picture that enjoyed the endorsement of a number of specialists and was presently on tour.

About a month later I saw the elaborate publication devoted to the picture in question by Professor Joanne Snow-Smith of the University of Washington, where the painting formed part of an exhibition of works from the collection of the Marquis de Ganay. [1] As I thumbed through the illustrations I could not help but recall that persistent journalist, for what confronted me in repeated details was an unappealing, poorly drawn and wooden image of Christ, His staring face framed by luxurious curls, His right hand held in a stiff gesture of blessing, and His feebly foreshortened left hand holding a poorly painted orb. Could this painting really be the source of so much concern?

However, as I began to read through the essay, I was met with yet another surprise, for it appeared that two prominent Leonardo specialists — Professor Carlo Pedretti at the University of California, Los Angeles, and the late Ludwig Heydenreich, who in 1964 had written an exemplary study of other known versions of the same composition — seem both to have endorsed the picture as an autograph work by Leonardo. Moreover, the picture had been examined in the conservation laboratories of the Louvre in 1972, and though the director, Madame Hours, understandably refrained from making any attribution, she evidently found no technical inconsistencies between the de Ganay painting and Leonardo's pictures in the Louvre.

According to Professor Smith the attribution of the picture to Leonardo was based on four sets of criteria. The first is the supposed resemblance of the de Ganay picture to a print made by the Bohemian artist, Wencelaus Hollar in 1650 (Fig. 2) that is inscribed "Leonardus da Vinci pinxit." The possibility that Hollar's print was based on a copy by a pupil of Leonardo is never seriously entertained, though no less than seven such copies are known. Let it be said at once that contrary to Professor Smith's assertion, the de Ganay picture differs quite considerably from the print. The configuration of the drapery is not the same, the arrangement of the hair is only analogous, the geometric designs on the stole and neckband are markedly more varied in the print, and one conspicuous detail in the painting — a large tuck in Christ's robe to which Professor Smith attaches great iconographic importance — is omitted in the print. It should also be said that despite the awkward drawing of the print — a characteristic feature of Hollar's work — it suggests a more refined prototype — whether by Leonardo or a follower is uncertain — than the de Ganay picture.

The second criterion on which the attribution of the painting was based is its alleged provenance. But here, once fact

Fig. 2. Salvator Mundi *by Wencelaus Hollar after Leonardo da Vinci, 1650.*

Fig. 3. Study for a Salvator Mundi *by Leonardo da Vinci, ca. 1510-1515. Windsor 12525.*

Royal Library, Windsor Castle Reproduced by gracious permission of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II

Fig. 4. Study for a Salvator Mundi *by Leonardo da Vinci, ca. 1510-1515. Windsor 12524.*

Royal Library, Windsor Castle Reproduced by gracious permission of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II

is separated from the elaborate piece of historical romance presented in the essay, we find only that the de Ganay painting is known to have been purchased in 1902 by the Comtesse de Behague from the Baron de Lareinty, who in turn is said to have acquired it from a convent in Nantes. This is slim evidence for an attribution of a picture presumed to have been painted in Milan in the early sixteenth century for an unknown patron. Professor Smith suggests that the patron was Louis XII, but there is no compelling reason this should be so.

The third criterion is a technical examination of the painting, and here we are presented with photographs of the picture viewed under infra-red light and x-rays. Contrary to the author's assertion, examination with infra-red light does not reveal "...the various stages and technique of construction" of a picture; it simply penetrates certain paint layers and can sometimes expose a preparatory drawing on the picture's ground. The drawing revealed in the robe and cloak of the de Ganay painting is dry and pedantic — quite unlike the preparatory drawing visible in the unfinished *Adoration of the Magi* in the Uffizi or the *Saint Jerome in the Vatican.* In actuality the underdrawing of Christ's robe in the de Ganay picture is based on a pricked cartoon. The small dots that result from such a transfer of design, though unnoticed by Professor Smith, are quite apparent with the naked eye. This observation is of some importance, for there exists a drawing by Leonardo at Windsor Castle for precisely this feature (Fig. 3). In 1964 Ludwig Heydenreich concluded from the evidence at hand that Leonardo must have made a cartoon for a Salvator Mundi that was later employed by a pupil to create a version which included that curious tuck found also in the de Ganay picture. Heydenreich did not then know the de Ganay painting. The de Ganay picture confirms the existence of such a cartoon. It is, however, difficult to believe that the author of the Windsor drawing, which reveals all the delicacy and beauty one associates with Leonardo, had anything to do with the mechanical underdrawing of the picture. There is at Windsor one further study for a Salvator Mundi, the sleeve of the right arm (Fig. 4). Unlike the picture mentioned by Heydenreich, the de Ganay painting does not reproduce the features of this drawing. Rather, it seems to be an amalgam of the two versions of the composition distinguished by Heydenreich.

Examination of the picture under x-rays yielded no positive evidence.

The last criterion applied was that of style. Professor Smith has had the courage to juxtapose details of the de Ganay picture with some of Leonardo's greatest masterpieces, and she sees fitting analogies for Christ's head in the *Mona Lisa* and the Saint Anne of the *Virgin and Child with Saint Anne* in the Louvre, and for His abysmally drawn raised hand in figures from *The Last Supper* in Milan and the *Saint John the Baptist* in the Louvre. Laying aside whatever superficial resemblances that exist between the de Ganay painting and these works by Leonardo, what is surely the most distressing thing is the disparity of quality between them. On this point, I can see no possible alternative to an informal opinion offered by Bernard Berenson many years ago. Professor Smith describes the scene. While a guest of the late Marquis Hubert de Ganay, Berenson "glanced at the painting of the Salvator Mundi on the wall and assessed it as a 'poor copy by an inferior pupil of Leonardo'." Though this verdict contradicts the opinions of Professors Pedretti and Heydenreich, it is the only one that, to my mind, carries any weight, and it is one that might even have satisfied an inquisitive journalist. □

Keith Christiansen
Metropolitan Museum of Art

Beauty and the Beasts: On Museums, Art, the Law and the Market
by Stephen E. Weil
Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C., 1983. 256 pp. $19.95 (cloth); $9.95 (paper).

Beauty and the Beasts: On Museums, Art, the Law and the Market is a collection of lectures and book reviews by Stephen E. Weil delivered or authored in the 1970s and 1980s. Weil is the deputy director of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden in addition to being a trustee of the Art Museum Association and a councilor-at-large of the American Association of Museums. Prior to employment as a museum administrator, he was a practicing attorney, and has proven himself to be one of the most astute observers of and commentators on the changes which are currently affecting the art world in general and museums in particular.

In Weil's own words the book is a mosaic. The task of reviewing it is complicated by the fact that Weil, himself, through the use of an "Introduction" and of strategically placed "Afterwords" has in essence already reviewed many of his articles and speeches. He has been entirely too tough on himself and it is clear to me that lawyers, in addition to never representing themselves, should never review their own works.

My major criticism of the book is one which, in legal terms, is "procedural." I believe the organization of the book could have been improved. Weil has assigned his essays to three categories: "Museums," "Museums and the Law," and "Art, the Law, and the Market." The decision to place certain articles in one section as opposed to another appears to be arbitrary and detracts from the book as a whole, since the subjects do not fall neatly into a single category.

The presentation of the materials would have been more effective if they appeared in chronological order and without division into sections. A presentation in this format would have enabled the reader to more easily see and appreciate the evolution of Mr. Weil's views with respect to the changing conditions of the art world — which views I hold in the highest regard.

In law school, law students are taught not to emphasize procedural form over substance and I have already spent too much time on form. As to substance, the only criticism that I have is that I wish the book had more material for me to read. I have listened to Mr. Weil speak on several occasions and I have read his writings, and after each time I came away with a greater awareness of issues and ideas than I had before. His most recent book is no exception.

Montauban: Musée Ingres

Roger et Angélique *by Ingres, 1841.*

To me, the most interesting articles are the ones on museums which were written in the early and mid-1970s. I never thought much about defining the roles of museums or about the difficulties that museums encounter in performing those roles. Although my legal practice involves artists, galleries and auction houses, I have never focused on the many problems which museums and their lawyers are faced with on a daily level. Weil's material sets forth both the practical and philosophical problems encountered.

Like most members of the public, I simplistically assumed that if an object appeared in a museum, it must be a masterpiece — otherwise why would it be there? In other words, the object had received someone's seal of approval. Weil has shown me the error of my thinking.

He has clearly and articulately explained the various and often competing functions of museums (the museum as "recreation," as "temple of contemplation," and "educat[or]," as "journalist," as "connoisseur," as "symbol of power," as "center for scholarship," as "an agent of social change," as "patron" and as "conservator.") While I have drawn no firm conclusions as to the propriety of those roles or the priority which should be placed on them, as a result of reading these articles I have a much better picture of the issues which must be addressed.

After discussing the philosophical aspects regarding the multifaceted roles which museums can play in society, Weil turns to the more mundane interaction between the law and museums. These articles on museums and the law should be required reading for every museum administrator. Weil begins and ends his second section with an overview of the area and in his role as oracle, predicts (in my opinion correctly) that museums will be continually and more regularly subjected to legal scrutiny. He next explains the lawyer's role, and cogently sets forth basic guidelines as to how and when to use legal counsel. Indeed he goes so far as to include a legal checklist which is invaluable to museums and lawyers alike.

Having unlocked the Pandora's Box of legal issues in his second section, Weil opens it completely in his third section. Although the third section of the book contains some material on the art market and the growth of that market as big business, most of it deals with two questions: is there a discipline known as art law and if so, what does it entail? Despite Weil's protestations to the contrary, there is an "art law" and he has contributed greatly to the field.

In 1974, Weil's first book entitled *Art Works: Law Policy and Practice,* which he co-authored with Franklin Feldman, was published. To this day it remains one of the most authoritative works in the field. In many ways, the third section of *Beauty and the Beasts* updates his first book. Of particular importance are the articles on resale royalties and moral rights legislation. The discussion of resale royalties, in my judgment, is the best ever written on the subject and the article on moral rights (which still remains a controversial area) goes a long way to explain the recent legislation passed by the New York and California legislatures. Weil also brings the reader up to date on recent court decisions involving the art world.

In sum, I wholeheartedly recommend *Beauty and the Beasts: On Museums, Art, the Law, and the Market* to lawyers, to museum administrators and most importantly, to the public generally. While there are some articles which are too technical ("MGR: A Conspectus of Museum Management") and some which are severely dated ("Review — Money and Art"), most of these essays can be reread with great profit because they make us think about important issues involving the art world and its relationship to society as a whole. □

Robert A. Weiner
Berger, Steingut, Weiner, Fox and Stern

The Forger's Art: Forgery and the Philosophy of Art
edited by Denis Dutton
University of California Press, Berkeley, 1982. 227 pp. with 17 figures. $22.50.

This small statue, originally attributed to the Egyptian 18th dynasty, was purchased by a private collector and deemed authentic by virtue of comparison with a "precedent class" of material, itself without firm provenance. Today experts know that the style is wrong and the pose of the figure is unacceptable. In 1981 the owner gave the piece to the Brooklyn Museum to include in its collection of forgeries, which now numbers about 50 objects.

This volume begins with an introductory chapter by Hope B. Werness which sketches the career of Hans van Meegeren and the events leading up to the trial of 1947 during the course of which the now famous "Vermeers" painted by Meegeren were first publically exposed for what they were—forgeries. Denis Dutton, as editor, then lines up eleven essays by different individuals, each of whom attempts to define the nature of a forgery by using the case against Meegeren as the point of departure.

Some of the essays had been either previously published or delivered as lectures (Alfred Lessing, 58ff; Leonard B. Meyer, 77ff; Nelson Goodman, 93ff; Mark Sagoff, 131ff; Dutton, 172ff; and Michael Wreen, 188ff). As a consequence the various contributors had the opportunity of knowing what their collaborators had to say. Each succeeding essay makes reference to what has preceded it in the book. Such a sequential plan is logical, but this arrangement is not readily apparent since the in-text references only refer to what has already appeared in the volume and do not alert the reader to what will follow. In this regard the index is hopelessly inadequate. As examples one could cite the comments of five contributors on the subject of a precedent class (50f;89; 101f; 110; 204; *passim*); or the observations of the ways in which an innocent spectator might react to two seemingly identical paintings, exhibited side by side, one of which is, however, known to be the forgery (63; 91; 95; 147; *passim*). Such flaws mar the enjoyment of reading the volume.

Lessing (58-76) argues that a forgery lacks the originality of the original it copies when viewed in an historical context. Wreen would tend to agree since he maintains that a forgery misrepresents achievement (215). In this assessment, both are supported by Francis Sparshott who demonstrates that the concern for originality within the historical context of its creation is dependent upon a Hegelian view of the history of art (250). Dutton's own contribution must be regarded in this same light (172-187), although Wreen does take exception to some of his argument (215) and Sparshott furthers the position taken by Lessing with regard to Hegel (249f). This theme is next taken up by Meyer (77-92) who maintains that the history of art is not only an evolutionary documentation of the monuments themselves but is also a similar documentation of society's cultural beliefs (92). When read together these essays place the acceptance of the "Vermeers" by Meegeren into its proper cultural perspective and thereby suggest that a similar situation, with a change in the principals, might conceivably arise anew. It is for precisely this reason that Rudolph Arnheim is so adamant in his stand against duplication (232-245). He maintains that a critic's task is difficult enough without having to be further encumbered by intentional falsification (245).

Goodman (93-114) presents an essay, the beginning of which must certainly be taken as a tongue-in-cheek tease. His premise here is that no two paintings—the one, the original and the other, a copy—are completely indistinguishable. This is in keeping with the conclusions of Lessing, Sparshott and Meyer. Jack Meiland, on the other hand, takes an opposing stand when he argues for the value of exact copies (115ff). His primary target is the essay of Meyer. Some of his arguments are not convincing,

particularly when he compares subsequently designed telephones and that designed by Bell to Delacroix's version of a Titan (121). Here Meiland is advocating his appearance theory of aesthetic value. There is not sufficient space here to explore this suggestion; the real question is whether or not the cultural bias of the West provides an environment in which this theory can find a place. One could profitably test Meiland's dicta against the arguments advanced by C.C. Vermeule, III, *Greek Sculpture and Roman Taste* (Ann Arbor 1977), since Vermeule there discusses the use of known, "exact" copies. On balance, however, it appears that the cultural prejudices of the West since the time of the Renaissance place little aesthetic value on such copies. Goodman's main thrust, however, is to indicate that the concept of forgery is generic to autography, the creation of something with one's own hand, and inapplicable to allography, the way in which a unit or letter is formed (102ff). This interesting differentiation is challenged by both Sagoff (144f; 147; 148; 151) and by Joseph Margolis who provides a neat series of rejoinders for those distinctions of Goodman (153; and *passim*).

Sagoff's contribution (131-152) rests upon a careful examination of the syntax employed in describing forgeries. If one agrees that there are several, different cultural forces bearing upon society's perceptions of forgeries, then it would follow that language and its use has to be included within the sum of those forces. And it is exactly this issue which Sagoff addresses. Sagoff then carries the thoughts of Meiland one step further when he introduces the concepts of forgeries and reproductions and of cognitive and pedagogical values (144ff). These pedagogical values are important for Monroe C. Beardsley (225-231) who regards great works of art, even if they are replicated, as a valuable means of promoting desirable human values (231). The main thrust of Sagoff's argument, however, is consistent with those of most of the contributors to this volume in that looking at a work of art is conditioned by a great deal of knowledge and that any aesthetic judgement requires "a rich basis of theoretical understanding" (150), doubtless provided by the cultural forces operative on the critic.

Sparshott provides an interesting concluding chapter in which he links art with love and forgery with carnal satisfaction (246-263). His point is well taken, in terms of what has come before in the volume. His reaction to the theorist who condones and accepts a forgery as a viable, and acceptable, aesthetic experience has had the tables turned on himself because the logical conclusion to this posture is decidedly antiart (263).

On the surface, I suppose, some will consider this volume to be a *divertissement,* and will content themselves to read each chapter independently as a self-contained essay, which in fact many are. To do so, however, would be to dilute seriously the purpose of the volume. Others might agree with the assessment that this volume is to be considered as yet another tedious contribution to an already "tired topic" (B. Shulgasse, in *The New York Times* (November 13, 1983), "Book Review," 20). Others will disagree because the subject of forgery in art is always fascinating. For example, we have witnessed a recent reassessment of the material associated with the Tomb of the Three Princesses by The Metropolitan Museum of Art (M. Brensen, "Met Museum Declares 17 Egyptian Items Fake," *The New York Times* CXXXI, no. 45 (June 15, 1982), Section 3, 45; and P.F. Dorman, "Modern Inscriptions in the Three Princesses Treasure," *Abstracts* (ARCE Annual Meeting, Ann Arbor 1983), 19), and have just been treated to a marvelous exhibiton of Egyptian forgeries in Munich (D. Wildung and S. Schostke, *Falsche Faraonen,* Munich 1983). The issues raised by the aestheticians marshalled by Dutton are those debated by graduate students, bandied about by collectors, critics, and hangers-on at openings and cocktail parties, and given serious consideration by those whose very livelihood depends upon the art market. When taken as a whole, then, the volume raises some interesting questions for which, as is generally the case with academic issues, there are no easy answers. □

Robert S. Bianchi
The Brooklyn Museum

Modern Museology: 108,000 images per disk

In April 1973, the cover of *Museum News* read, "Museums and Computers: Strange Bedfellows." In the ten years that have passed, the notion of joining computers and museums has become a *fait-accompli,* and in fact, some museums have advanced beyond the implementation stage and are now seeking to upgrade and enhance systems already in operation. The Museum of the American Indian in New York City provides an example of such an organization.

The Museum, which has a large comprehensive collection of over one million art objects and artifacts dealing with American Indians, began the process of computerizing its collection in 1976. The first phase consisted of an actual physical inventory, examining each piece individually for purposes of determining the need for conservation and for accuracy in existing documentation. Catalogue information was organized into a series of descriptive fields and symbols were assigned to each field. All information available on each object was entered into a code card system, allowing the entire collection to be uniformly organized. All fields of information (region of origin, date of execution, object name, . . .) were available for each object, but each field did not need to be completed. Thus, a system for organizing data was adopted that was flexible enough to allow for the uncertainties of the objects in question, but the system was efficient enough that information could be easily sorted and retrieved.

This initial phase took four years to complete and involved approximately forty to fifty people, including several graduate students in anthropology who assisted in the referencing and documenting of the artifacts. Midway through, there was a new focus in collections' management: electronics. The work accomplished enabled the Museum staff to place more easily their now organized information on a computer. A system had been developed that allowed for the addition of new information, and the deletion of data; empty fields could be filled in if new data was found regarding an object, and it was also possible to simply leave fields blank. The only information field which must be utilized is that of inventory number. In order to retrieve or to sort information in search of a particular object, the computer is offered all the available information, and responds with all objects within the collection that have comparable descriptions. The more informa-

tion initially offered to the computer search, the fewer the batches of information the system will retrieve.

The Museum of the American Indian was involved in a time-sharing computer system, in which the computer was linked to a data bank and the Museum literally shared access to the computer with other customers of the same company. This system proved inadequate for the Museum's needs. Dr. Roland Force, director of the Museum, feels that the computer company did not understand their needs, and had such a high rate of personnel turnover that his staff often had to repeat instructions. Dr. Force pointed out that consultations with the firm to gain further information on the system and its capabilities, were expensive.

The Museum has now converted to micro-computers and ulitizes an in-house computer system which has been divided into two programs: collection management and membership and development. The system has a large capacity for storage and eventual modification. The Museum has also added a computer specialist to the staff, so that problems can be solved within the museum structure.

To understand how the Museum's system functions it is best to illustrate a catalogue card for a specific object and provide an example of a computer printout record. The computer has the potential to give descriptive information regarding its provenience, the materials used, a record of whether or not photographs exist, and whether the object is on display or on loan to another institution. The various numerical codes that appear can be translated into words. For instance, 130 indicates pottery, 538 means inlaid, 544 means mold-made,. . .

Rather than analyze an exhaustive printout, a sketch of the type of information provided by the computer will be described. For illustration, object number 22-6248 has been selected. This is a pottery figure of a standing man with elaborate headdress. The computer printout would read:

226248 0001 0000 MX
00747 02 02061 1

The first set of numbers indicates the catalogue number. The second that it is one object. The next two fields if utilized would tell the viewer if the object were on loan or no longer in the possession of the museum. If the object had been removed from the collection, there are a series of explanatory codes which tell one precisely why the object is unavailable. For instance, the artifact could have been removed from display, destroyed, stolen, or sold.

Next, the printout offers a two letter abbreviation of the state or country of origin of the object, in this case Mexico (MX). After this field has been established, it can be further broken down by specific geographic information. The list of towns, villages, archaeological sites, and reservations is limitless, but the Museum does have a separate coded file that presents all the names represented in their computer inventory. Here, one finds that 00747 translates to Aztec-Kiutecuhli. The next field explains how the museum acquired the piece. 02 indicates that this was a gift to the museum. The field also indicates when an object is a bequest, retrieved from an excavation, purchased, or on loan from another institution. The field of information which appears next indicates either the collector or donor of the artifact. These names are also available in a coded file. Finally, the last field indicates if the museum has photographed the piece. 1, as in this example, explains that a black and white photograph exists. 2 indicates a color photograph has been made, and 3 indicates that both a color and a black and white photograph are available.

While this is a simplistic discussion of the field system in operation, it does serve as a brief introduction to the way in which it is possible to provide for the maximum information available. Yet, the user is able to utilize only those fields which pertain to specific objects without disabling the system. The data system holds the same information that the card catalogue would, but collection-wide searches can be conducted with ease. If for instance, someone wanted to determine how many objects had been received from a certain donor, he would not have to look manually through the catalogue. The search can be conducted utilizing the code for that donor. The same is true, if one wanted to know how many painted effigies from Venezuela were in the collection. The investigation could be initiated using the code for effigy-painted (520) and the code for Venezuela (VE). Then once the computer provided all general information, the search could be further broken down using other descriptive codes.

Utilizing an in-house system places a certain responsibility on the organization to insure, as the relationship between the computer and the museum matures, that difficulties are recognized and overcome. More than undertaking simple system modifications, museum professinals must remain abreast of developments in computer technology and be aware of the possibilities of upgrading equipment or adding compatible equipment. Serious consideration must also be given to the problems of funding, for there is a necessity to "keep up" with the technological changes, so that the museum is not faced soon with the problems of entirely outdated collection management systems.

The Museum of the American Indian was careful in selecting their computer system. Dr. Force believes they have selected equipment with which they can grow. In fact, the Museum is currently reviewing the possibility of adding a video disk component to their in-house computer. This would enable users of the system to call up a video image as well as all pertinent catalogue information. Dr. Force indicated that this addition would save time and help to conserve objects. The object and the information can be projected on adjacent screens and the video disk attachments can also print copies of the images. Dr. Force noted that the conservation of objects is not often emphasized in discussions of computer systems. While a video image can never replace the actual viewing of an object it can offer the researcher an accurate idea. If only a brief glance or memory refresher is needed, rare and delicate objects can be spared unnecessary handling.

Initially, it would require a great effort to integrate the video disk into the existing system, as each artifact will have to be photographed. This is both a time consuming and a costly process. On average, the cost of producing a video disk is $3,000, assuming 108,000 images per disk. However, it is important to note that to duplicate a completed disk costs approximately $15-$25. Therefore, a museum could, potentially, recoup some of the expenses associated with acquiring the video disk system by offering copies of the disk to other organizations. This would enable other museums to have access to the museum's collection, but it would not have to be through access to the museum's actual computer system. This would, in effect, solve certain security problems that have been troubling many people.

To conclude, the Museum of the American Indian has a computer system which functions, and which they are constantly updating and editing. Dr. Force commented that individuals should not be intimidated by computer equipment

nor by computer experts. Museum personnel must feel free to explain their needs and insist that all aspects of the computer system in question be fully explained. Each museum can "learn from the experience of others. People do not always ask enough questions, early enough." The primary concern should be for the data itself. The computer is, from the museum's standpoint, simply a tool to convey vital information about holdings within a collection. The system should enhance access to the collection, not replace it. Information should not under any circumstance be forced into a system, which must be flexible yet efficient. While a computer company's idea of efficiency might be to gather the most material in the least amount of space, the Museum of the American Indian has been unconcerned with empty computer space. The result is a simple field system which works well for them. This empty space allows the Museum to insert any information which becomes available about the many artifacts which presently have incomplete documentation.

In less than fifteen years, the utilization of computers for collections management has gone from a possibility to a reality. Cooperation and communication between the designers and the users of computers are proving to be the two most important factors in establishing systems which are both functional and flexible. □

Lisa Ackerman
Samuel H. Kress Foundation

Photograph courtesy of Museum of the American Indian, Hyde Foundation.

Terra cotta standing figure with elaborate headdress who represents the fire god priest Kiutechuli, ca. A.D. 300-900. Las Remojades. Vera Cruz, Mexico.

Art Research News
Volume 2, Number 4/1983

Art Research News is the membership publication of the International Foundation for Art Research.
Editor: Joan Huntoon
Editorial Associate: Linda E. Ketchum

International Foundation for Art Research
Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., President
Bonnie Burnham, Executive Director
Virgilia H. Pancoast, Authentication Service
Lynn Stowell Pearson, Art Theft Archive
Francine Leblache, European Correspondent

Board of Directors
Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., *President,* David Bathurst, Robert Bernhard, Bernard V. Bothmer, Bonnie Burnham, David Dalva, Franklin Feldman, Paul C. Guth, Alice M. Kaplan, Gregor Leinsdorf, Leon Levy, Lawrence J. Majewski, Jules H. Marckmann, John L. Marion, Clyde Newhouse, Donald Oresman, Edmund P. Pillsbury, John P. Richardson, Craig Hugh Smyth, Stephen E. Weil, Malcolm Wiener, Daniel Zilkha.

Advisory Council
H. Harvard Arnason, Juan Ainaud De Lasarte, Jean Adhémar, Diego Angulo Iniguez, Miklos Boskovits, Bernard V. Bothmer, Dietrich von Bothmer, Jonathan Brown, François Daulte, Charles Durand-Ruel, Gordon F. Ekholm, Sydney Freedberg, Lloyd Goodrich, E. Haverkamp-Begemann, Michael Jaffé, José López-Rey, Lawrence J. Majewski, David G. Mitten, Priscilla Muller, Konrad Oberhuber, Donald Posner, Theodore Reff, Willibald Sauerländer, Edward V. Sayre, Hubert F. von Sonnenburg, James Stubblebine, Louise A. Svendsen, J. Kirk T. Varnedoe, John Walsh, Ellis K. Waterhouse, Christopher J. White, Federico Zeri.

Membership and Subscription:
Active Member (*Art Research News, Stolen Art Alert,* complimentary invitations to events), $80; Subscriber (publications, notices of events), Individual, $40, Institutional, $60; Sponsor/Corporate Member (publications, invitations, staff consultation, complimentary back run of all publications), $250; Patron (all of above plus authentication of one work of art), $1000; Benefactor (all of above, major part of contribution used to support IFAR's activities), $5000; overseas members add $15 for mailing.

Membership in IFAR, a non-profit educational organization, is tax deductible. Membership inquiries and payment should be directed to IFAR, 46 East 70th Street, New York, N.Y. 10021. Tel.: (212) 879-1780.

Founded under a grant from the Jerome Foundation

Benefactors and Patrons
An Anonymous Benefactor
Mary Duke Biddle Foundation
Brookehill Capital Management
Chubb and Son
CG/Aetna Insurance Company
Dillon Fund
Lucius Eastman
J. Paul Getty Trust
Gulf and Western Foundation
Hammer Galleries
Hartford Insurance Company
Fred C. Koch Trust
Samuel H. Kress Foundation
Robert Lehman Foundation
Jerome Levy Foundation
Ralph E. Ogden Foundation
Billy Rose Foundation
Marvin Schur
Sotheby Parke Bernet
Lila Wallace Fund
Edwin L. Weisl, Jr.
Malcolm H. Wiener
Charles and Ann Winner

©1983 International Foundation for Art Research

IFAR Authentications

In the recent past two of IFAR's most interesting authentication studies have involved an unusually astute collector and a contemporaneous copy of a well-known work.

Two unsigned landscapes, oil on canvas, were purchased in an antique shop by a collector in Seattle, Washington. On a subsequent trip to Austria he noticed a marked similarity in style between his paintings and one by Anton Faistenberger (1663-1708) in the Salzburger Residenz-Galerie in Salzburg. On his return he contacted IFAR for an authentication examination, which confirmed what his keen collector's eye had revealed to him. His new acquisitions were indeed authentic works by Faistenberger, an artist from Salzburg, who travelled to Rome and Venice and then took up residence in Vienna, where he was commissioned to work for the emperor.

At about the same time IFAR was contacted by the Arnot Art Museum in Elmira, New York, concerning a small oil on canvas in its collection, *Approaching Storm* by Albert Bierstadt (1830-1902). A resident of East Amherst, New York had come to the Museum with an exact duplicate, which she had inherited, also signed A. Bierstadt.

IFAR submitted both works to an American paintings expert and a conservator, who concluded that the Arnot Museum version was an original Bierstadt executed in 1854 on a trip to his native Westphalia in Germany. The other version was probably painted after his return to the United States by one of his New Bedford, Massachusetts students between 1857 and 1859.□

Private collection.

Untitled landscape by Anton Faistenberger, ca. 1700.

Elmira, N.Y.: Arnot Art Museum

Approaching Storm *by Albert Bierstadt, 1854.*

RECEIVED
MAR 22 1984
Library, MMA.

Private collection.

Untitled landscape by Anton Faistenberger, ca. 1700.

Private collection.

A copy of Approaching Storm *by Albert Bierstadt, probably by one of his students; ca. 1857-1859.*

RECEIVED
MAR 22 1984
Library, MMA.